

— o THE o —

SCOTT ACT

DISSECTED.

BY VINO VERITAS.

COPYRIGHT SECURED.

APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PAMPHLET TO BE MADE TO
GEO. C. WHITE, ST. THOMAS, ONT.

800. 16/16

THE SCOTT ACT DISSECTED.

BY VINO VERITAS.

Any measure, proposition or device, conceived or invented for the benefit of humanity or the improvement of society, should, and ought to have, a warm approval, a true appreciation and a fair trial upon its merits. The malice of man, aided by the genius of science, has from time immemorial invented most formidable weapons for human destruction, not only physically, but morally, socially, and even politically. The disseminator of immoral literature, either light, profound, or picturesque, makes a fearful onslaught on the bulwarks of intelligence, and depraves not only the uneducated, but also the most learned minds. With depravity of mind come laxity of morals and all the concomitant evils. Social evils destroy more lives in a century than war and pestilence. It is unnecessary to enumerate them or to point out their fatal effects upon humanity, for they are unfortunately too apparent even to the casual observer. Political evils often produce the ruin of nations, as well as the destruction of thousands of lives; and may be brought about by the caprice of a despot, the ambition of a statesman; the avarice of a demagogue; the imprudence of a zealot, or the rascality of a hypocrite. As a rule, we can generally find a remedy for every evil, which, if not a positive cure, will at least tend to mitigate it; and probably, after a faithful application of the remedy for a reasonable time, the effects of the evil may be so visibly ameliorated that the cause will seem to have totally disappeared. Before proceeding further I will try to define the true meaning of an evil, according to my humble interpretation of the word; and though my knowledge may not be quite so extensive as many who will criticise and take exception to the views I enunciate, I feel satisfied that impartial minds will give me credit at least for consistency and common sense. My idea of an evil is: that it is a subtle and insidious agent (assuming various degrees of intensity) which tends to captivate, conquer, demoralize and destroy all that is good in man. An acquired bad habit is not essentially an evil; it is more a misfortune or a disease and should be treated as such. It is claimed by a large and intelligent portion of Canadians that the evil effects produced by the sale of intoxicating liquors are sufficient to warrant the assumption that the liquor traffic is a social evil more dangerous to the welfare of society than

any other existing evil—many worse existing to the contrary notwithstanding—and they suggest as the only remedy for the removal of this evil that : the manufacture and sale of liquor be entirely prohibited. Never did *intelligence*, with any conception of the meaning of *liberty*, betray signs of such utter imbecility. When a man is intelligent, he is supposed to be liberty-loving; being liberal, he should be just; and if just, how can he be arbitrary? Every person who can read, in the whole Dominion of Canada, must have often seen that quotation from the "Letters of Junius," "The subject who is truly loyal to the Chief Magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures," paraded as the motto of one of the most influential Canadian newspapers. Whether this journal lives up to its motto or not, it is not my purpose to discuss, because the anomalies of political journalism have to be tolerated, if not respected. However, I feel bound to say that any person who advocates the application of the "Scott Act," whether he be journalist, statesman, priest, parson or preacher, is both arbitrary and unjust; or else fanatical, mercenary or hypocritical. The "Scott Act" was conceived in hypocrisy, nursed in deception, and developed by fanaticism. At the time Mr. Mackenzie went into power, one of the planks in his reform platform was suppression of the liquor traffic; but after settling down to business at Ottawa, he began to think that the temperance plank would either have to be split in two, sawed in the middle, or heaved out of the platform altogether. His faithful henchman, Mr. Scott, came to the rescue of the plank by framing a bill out of it. Neither Mr. Scott, nor Mr. Mackenzie ever believed in the rantings of the prohibitionists, but political expediency forced them to manifest a desire of fulfilling—at least in part—some of their promises. Mr. Mackenzie felt his position to be something like that of Pontius Pilate. A lot of howling fanatics were clamoring for the crucifixion of the liquor traffic. "Right" and "justice" said that those engaged in it should not be financially ruined, and that the country could not afford to have its revenue depleted to such an extent. Mr. Mackenzie was desirous to wash his hands out of it, so Mr. Scott furnished the soap and water. Mr. Scott deserves praise for extricating the Premier from a very annoying predicament, by throwing the onus of prohibition back upon the people, and practically relieving parliament of all further trouble in the matter. But neither he nor any of his colleagues can claim that the passage of the "Scott Act" entitles them to any credit as broad-minded, liberal and courageous statesmen, according to a proper interpretation of the meaning of constitutional government. As I understand

constitutional government, the sovereign power accords the right to the people to elect from amongst them a legislative body to whom are entrusted the privilege and power of enacting laws, best suited to the happiness and contentment of the nation. If ever a government had this power substantially invested in it, Mr. Mackenzie's had. But what use was made of the prerogative is illustrated to a certain extent by the "Scott Act." If it were found necessary to pass a law for the partial or total suppression of the liquor traffic, why not pass it manfully and courageously, instead of throwing it like a bone of contention to the people, and telling them to fight away over it? The Scott Act is not in reality a statutory law; it is a mere privilege granted to fanaticism to triumph over common sense; it is an abuse of the power of majorities; and a flagrant injustice to the rights of minorities. What would be thought of an English M. P. who would rise in his place, in the House of Commons, and move the adoption of a Bill enabling the Irish people to decide by vote whether Home Rule was the will of the majority or not? In all probability the motion would be referred to a committee on lunacy. And should another member move that the people of the three Kingdoms have the privilege of regulating the liquor traffic by a vote of the majority in each electoral riding, he would be greeted with such an outburst of derisive hilarity that he would feel like immediately checking his baggage for Halton or Kansas. The Scott Act has developed an important feature, which many may not have noticed, namely, the advantage which the Methodist Ministers have gained by it as a test of their strength. It must be apparent to even the most indifferent observer, that all other denominations have held aloof from it, while the Methodists adopted it as their *own*, encouraged its submittal; urged, begged, and beseeched for its success; and wherever it has been carried successfully, *they* can claim the credit. Other Churches very wisely considered that the proper way to inculcate temperance was by Christian law and moral suasion, and that when it is found necessary to apply civil law, let the civil officers apply it. They also, very likely concluded, that a religion which cannot propagate its doctrines, without having recourse to state aid, must be a very poor religion indeed. To those clerical gentlemen who make themselves so conspicuous in Scott Act campaigns, I would beg the liberty of addressing a few words, for the purpose of showing how much out of place a clergyman is, when he assumes the role of a demagogue. In the first place these gentlemen believe in the teachings of the Bible, and are supposed to inculcate all that is good and holy from it to those who are subject to their

ministrations. Now, where in the Bible, I ask, is the moderate use of wine forbidden? Are we not told that God first directed its manufacture? And, although the first vintner got gloriously drunk, the Lord did not prohibit the growth of the grape, and the manufacture of wine. In fact, it went on successfully for four thousand and four years, after which time the Redeemer of the world chose it as the elementary representation of the precious blood that He was about to shed for the redemption of all mankind. How can a Methodist Preacher reconcile prohibition with these Biblical facts? Subsequently to the planting of the first vineyard (I do not know the exact length of time, but it is quite a while at all events, the preachers will know, I presume), the Almighty gave the Commandments to Moses, but not one of the ten says, "thou shalt not drink wine." No, nor even thou shalt not get drunk. The preachers seem to think the Almighty forgot the eleventh commandment, and that they have a right to supply the deficiency by substituting the Scott Act. If they would pay more attention to the ten they *have* got, and abandon speculation in the development of an eleventh one, they would be more in their place as ministers of the gospel, more respected as sensible men, and do a thousand times more for the cause of true temperance than the Scott Act or Prohibition can ever possibly accomplish. The teaching of the Bible plainly and distinctly commiserates drunkenness; yes, and palliates sin committed by parties while in that state; yes, and even chastises those who dare to ridicule a man while he was sleeping off the effects of too heavy potations. The preacher who will deny this denies the Bible; the preacher who states that wine is a curse, any more than any other gift of God to man, states what is contrary to the Bible; yes, and he accuses God of being the author of that curse. Some of those self-constituted, sanctified chemists will even boldly affirm that the wine of the Bible did not contain alcohol, and that is the reason why God allowed its use. Chemistry has yet to learn by what process wine can be made, so that the alcohol will be eliminated, instead of being generated, during the process of fermentation. But the fact that people of the Bible got drunk upon it, is a sufficient refutation of such an ignorant assertion. If liquor is a curse in any shape, it is made so by those who abuse its use. Almost anything can be made a curse by the same process. Why it is even declared by the celebrated Revivalist, Caughey, that the Bible itself can be made a curse. In his "Revival Miscellany," (page 94), I find the following: "I have heard Missionaries on the platform exalt the Bible, and say that it is a blessing. *I say men make it a curse.* Don't misunderstand me, it is a torch.

It will light him to a knowledge of his sins ; it will light him to the foot of the cross ; it will light him to Heaven. But it may be a double torch ; and if a man will not be lighted by it to Heaven, it will light him to Hell." Now here is irrefutable evidence that a Methodist Preacher is as liable to be led to Hell, by the Bible, as an Inebriate is by alcohol. The Bible tells us that man is a free agent to do good or evil. If his propensity to evil predominates to such an extent that others are liable to suffer the consequences of his vicious practices, then society has a right to protect itself against contamination. But, when a man simply abuses a gift, either spiritual or temporal, which God, nature or earth has given him for his use and benefit, and turns it into a detriment, or a curse to himself, that is *his own fault*, and nobody's business but his. Wine is one of the most bountiful gifts that nature produces for man, and alcohol is one of the most potent and indispensable remedies that Chemistry has given to medical science. Then if one man abuses either of these gifts, is it right that a hundred men should be debarred from the privilege of using them in moderation ? If the Premier of England finds it necessary for his health to take a drink of liquor occasionally, is it right that he should be prevented from doing so, because there happens to be a lot of worthless, drunken wretches in the slums of London, Edinburgh and Dublin ? Mr. Gladstone, the present Premier, is perhaps one of the grandest men in the world, and if hypocrisy could possibly be put to shame, the temperance hypocrites of Canada should blush to the roots of their hair when they read that his greatest oratorical efforts are moistened with moderate potations of stimulating beverages, mixed to suit his taste, by no less a personage than his most amiable wife. If the wife of a Canadian Premier were to do this, she would be held up to the execration of her sex, while in England she is regarded as a true model of conjugal felicity. If such an occurrence should take place on a public platform in Canada, why, the preachers and their "press" would chant a dirge more loud and lengthy than the lamentations of Jeremiah. We are told by these clerical gentlemen and temperance orators generally, that liquor is not only absolutely poisonous, but also "liquid fire and distilled damnation." Well, then, I would ask, who has furnished us with the ingredients for poisoning our bodies, and damning our souls ? I pause for a reply. When a Methodist Minister or a hired temperance orator states that alcohol is poison, when properly and judiciously taken into the system, I can only call him an *ignoramus* ; (I like to call everything by its proper name), but when a professional man, such as a medical

doctor or practical chemist makes such an assertion, he is a hypocritical falsifier of scientific truth. Every doctor knows that there is no remedy within the realm of therapeutics that can so quickly and effectually repair the loss sustained by waste of tissue, or raise the system from a state of depression or prostration to that of activity and vivacity as alcohol properly administered. I could give several examples of its efficacy in cases of sickness, but will confine myself to a few, for proof of which I can produce the living witnesses. I know a man who is now as healthy and strong as it is necessary for any ordinary man to be, who was at one time so prostrated by typhoid fever that no hope for his life was entertained by the doctor attending him. He was considered an excellent doctor, and treated his patient with the greatest possible attention, but to no purpose. A second doctor was called in, who immediately prescribed stimulants, and to my certain knowledge a visible change for the better took place within twelve hours, and the patient grew gradually better, and finally recovered. He drank on an average a pint of brandy per day. He is now alive, is as temperate a man as there is in the county he lives in, is worth some fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, therefore cannot have much of an object in telling an untruth, and he is willing, at any time, to vouch for the truth of this assertion. So are both doctors. I know another man, far gone in consumption, who will declare that he has been kept alive for the last five years by spirits. But the most peculiar case of all is that of a little four year old girl, now living, and to be seen every day in the week. This child was born one month before the time allotted by nature, and children born at this stage of fecundity, are not expected to live. In this case the infant was so well developed that the doctor conceived the idea that life might be sustained by the use of stimulants, and accordingly prescribed brandy, to be given at stated intervals, for a month or longer, if required. The result was that the child grew and is alive now, so are its parents, so is the doctor, all of whom will testify to the truth of this statement. Now, if alcohol be an absolute poison, how is it that a fragile creature, like that child, was not instantly killed by even a spoonful? If alcohol is useful to medical science, is it not monstrous to suppose that its manufacture and sale should be prohibited because a few Methodist preachers and temperance cranks require it? I now proceed to examine the effects produced in various countries by the use of intoxicating beverages, and compare liquor-drinking people with total abstainers, by way of illustrating how odious are comparisons. I will commence with England, where wine,

beer, rum, gin and brandy are used, by prince and peasant, by lord and commoner, and ask, is England a degraded, besotted, demoralised, benighted, ignorant, cowardly nation of people? Or is it not the very reverse? Whiskey and ale are drank in Scotland, and where is there a more thrifty, more healthy, or better educated race of people on the face of the earth? The Irish are said to have brought all their misfortunes, political and otherwise, upon themselves, by over indulgence in a "drop of the crathur," but I notice they hold their own in the march of human progress, physically, intellectually, and morally. The German Empire is a nation of drinkers, and what position does it hold in the world to-day? If the use of intoxicating liquors were as dangerous to health as some of the temperance orators would have us believe, why, the German race should have been extinct by this time. In France, Italy and Spain, wine is drank as freely as milk, and is considered as necessary as any other article of food. It is used at nearly every meal, and its nutritive qualities may be judged from the fact that a laborer in those countries will make as good a meal, and feel far more healthy, on some bread and butter, and cheese, or vegetables and maccaroni, or rice and a pint of wine, than a Canadian who fills himself up with pork or beef, pickles, pies and cakes, and three or four cups of slow poison called green tea. The wine used contains from 8 to 15 per cent. of absolute alcohol. What a wonder it is those people have not all been poisoned long ago! If France were deprived of her vineyards what would become of her thrifty peasantry, her grand army and navy, her brilliant literature, her mint of science, her enormous wealth? Intemperance in the wine-producing countries of Europe is almost entirely unknown, but every person drinks what they consider healthful and nourishing. It has been related that the Irish apostle of temperance, Father Matthew, (who, by the way, made more true teetotallers than all the Methodist preachers of Canada put together, without the aid of an act of parliament either, but by purely moral suasion) wrote to the then ruling Pope for his blessing and encouragement in the holy cause he was engaged in. And it is said that the Pope really did not understand what the good man meant. He actually thought he was taking leave of his senses, and wrote to his ecclesiastical superior to look after him, adding that no man in his right senses would think of depriving people of their wine. Thereupon Father Matthew set out for Rome, where he explained verbally the nature of his mission and was rather surprised to learn that the Pope, who was then an aged man, had never seen a drunken man in the whole

course of his life. I merely quote this to prove how a nation of drinkers need not necessarily be a nation of drunkards. They can also be a nation of healthy, intelligent and moral people. And here I would ask, how many of the great men in the world's history were total abstainers? I hope to be pardoned for answering this question myself by a rather commonplace expression, viz., "They were like hens teeth." And now suppose we compare the nations that don't drink with those that do. Can we compare Turkey with England, or China with France? Let the preachers answer. It is claimed that drunkenness is the source of nearly all the crimes committed in the country, and that it has a tendency to engender a hereditary propensity to evil. By actual observation I find that such is not the fact, because, though many crimes are perpetrated by drunkards, liquor only performs the duty of stimulating the criminal to execute that which he had conceived, planned and matured in sobriety but lacked the courage to carry into execution. Liquor, therefore, was not the primary cause. Neither is intemperance hereditary, because I have seen drunken fathers raise sober, industrious, and exemplary families, whereas I have seen strictly temperate and religious fathers raise sons that were not only drunkards but irreligious blackguards. Are all the professional burglaries, robberies, gambling swindles, confidence games, &c., planned and carried out by drunkards? Certainly not, but by sober, calm, level-headed scoundrels. Are the professional gamblers who strut about our streets in day-time, decked out in the finest raiment, seeking for innocent lambs to fleece at night, drunkards? No, they are cool, calculating rascals. Are the vile seducers of our daughters, sisters, aye, even our wives—drunkards? Why no, the very atmosphere surrounding them is fragrant with perfumes of the East, instead of being reeking with the fumes of liquor: Is the rape fiend or other monster in human form, as a rule, a drunkard. No, he is by nature a brute. (what nature gives nothing can take away), therefore nothing is required to brutalise him. Are the secret vices and practices which prevail throughout the land and are sapping the foundations of virtue, blurring the grace of modesty and defying the laws of nature, the result of drunkenness? The answer is still, no. The most stupendous crime that disgraces our civilisation is the Donnelly massacre. Was it caused by drunkenness? No, it could never have been perpetrated so effectually by drunken men. The whole thing was planned and put into execution by men whose savage natures might have been modified if they only had partaken of liquor before commencing

ing the awful butchery. It is my firm belief that had some one of the party suggested the propriety of taking some liquor before commencing the fearful work and that it was acted upon, it would have had the effect of arousing whatever spirit of manhood, nobleness of soul, or fear of God that might be possessed by some of the party, but was stagnated for the time being, by the fell purpose of revenge, and in all probability the murder would never have been committed. Was the murder of poor Campbell by his wife Phœbie, and her paramour the result of drunkenness? Oh, no, it was a villainous double crime of adultery and murder concocted and committed in perfect sobriety. And now to come nearer home. A few years ago there lived in St. Thomas one of the most rabid temperance cranks and religious monomaniacs that could be found. He is now serving a term in the Kingston penitentiary for being a mean robber. Was this crime caused by drunkenness? No. Was it ever caused by poverty? No, because he robbed a man who was paying him good wages. Next we have Ab. Wrightman whom the Judge complimented on his fine looks. Were his crimes caused by drink? Certainly not. Or did he inherit his vice from a drunken, wicked father? Not at all. His father was at a prayer meeting the night he is supposed to have brutally murdered poor old Grant Silcox, or at least on the night he robbed Campbell's store. It is also stated that Wrightman got religion at a Methodist protracted meeting, and was even a class leader at Sabbath school, an exhorter, &c., and God only knows what else, all of which, however, is respectfully submitted for the consideration of prohibitionists. This is a specimen of the sly, sneaking, hypocritical scoundrels who commit all the really revolting and abominable crimes in the country. How different a character from that of the honest, open-hearted young man who loves jollity and society, and whose very presence is a source of happiness, not only to his parents and sisters, but to every person with whom he comes in contact. The very worst class of criminals always make a scapegoat of liquor when caught in the meshes of the law. The most brutal ruffians, by nature, will stand upon the gallows and declare that liquor brought them to that sad end, and the preacher in attendance will say amen to every word. They will also assure their hearers that they have not the least doubt about being received into the arms of Jesus, and the preacher will say amen again. They will claim that they were not responsible for the commission of the crime (it was liquor that did it,) and the preacher will groan out another amen. Such audacious presumption upon God's mercy and

justice is not only an outrage to religion but an insult to common decency. I cannot believe that liquor engenders a propensity to crime in man for several reasons, the principle one of which I have Biblical authority for. The first murder recorded in the Bible is that of Abel, by his brother Cain. Now Cain must have been an eminently sober man, because he could have had no means of getting intoxicated. If, therefore, the first great capital crime of murder and fratricide was committed in sobriety, does it not go far in proving that a strictly temperance man is as liable to commit a heinous crime as a hopeless drunkard? I think it does. In the course of my life I have met inveterate toppers, who were the most honest, good-natured, charitable, whole-souled men I have ever met with. They were generally men who would despise a mean action and shudder at the thought of crime, men in whom liquor could raise no demon, simply because there was none in their natures. On the other hand I have met men upon whom a small quantity of liquor would have the effect of stirring up demons of discord, jealousy, hatred, anger and ill-will. I therefore contend that unless evil is in a man's nature, liquor cannot create it. Having now shown (at least to my own satisfaction) that the arguments used by the advocates of the Scott Act are based upon the fabric of a vision, I will proceed, without passion or prejudice, to an examination of that elaborate document upon its merits. Before going further, however, I wish it to be distinctly understood that there is not a more ardent admirer of true temperance in Canada to-day, than the writer of these lines. But, although I pity a drunkard, I despise a fanatic, and I utterly detest a hypocrite. If ever a man was engaged in a holy cause, in a truly noble and philanthropic mission, it is in the propagation and promotion of true temperance principles, because he is the promoter of true happiness, a messenger of benevolence, charity, peace and good-will among mankind. The great object which all men have—or should have—in view, is the attainment of their own happiness. This is a propensity implanted in the constitution of our natures, which all unavoidably obey, but by which all do not equally profit, simply because too many have mistaken notions of the means to be adopted, in order to arrive at true happiness. Now that the Scott Act is not among those means, I intend to show, from the fact that it is incompatible with justice, inconsistent with charity, and subversive of liberty (without which no real happiness can exist) and that it has a tendency to lead men away from the paths of rectitude, patriotism and principle, which should be pursued by those who heartily and honestly

engage in the noble work of raising men from degradation to honor. It fosters contention and wrangling, instead of producing peace and harmony. It takes all that is dignified, noble and moral out of the temperance cause by converting it into a politico-religious squabble. Its mission is to divide, instead of unify public sentiment; and to create bad feelings between neighbors. It encourages vice, by opening up a new field for betting and gambling speculators. It erects a platform upon which sanctimonious hypocrisy can swagger, but does not provide even standing room for the argumentations of reason, right, truth and justice. It accords the right to an extremist, a fool or a fanatic, to say to a rational being, "My will is law, and you *must* obey it." It makes every man in the community a legislator, and if the majority happen to be fools, the wise men must submit to be ruled by them, because they are in the minority and have no redress, not even the right of appeal. It therefore tends to make majorities brutal, while it renders minorities helpless. Many people seem to forget that the rights of minorities are deserving of as much consideration as the will of majorities, and this reminds me of an address, delivered by His Honor, Judge Hughes, to the grand jury at the opening of the last County Court. The St. Thomas Times reports that His Honor took occasion to refer to the Scott Act, and to impress upon the gentlemen of the grand jury his feelings as regarded its submittal. I do not for a moment propose to discuss the propriety of a County Judge advertising to such a topic, nor attempt to impugn the motives by which he was actuated, but if the Times be correct, the Judge is reported to have made use of an expression which I consider inconsistent with my idea of justice, viz.: that "the will of the majority should rule." These may not be the exact words, but they fully express the idea in effect. I would respectfully beg permission to ask His Honor if he is not bound by virtue of his exalted office and in obedience to the laws which he is sworn to administer in an impartial, fearless and just manner, to honor the opinion of one man as opposed to that of eleven, and to give the prisoner at the bar the benefit of that one man's opinion as opposed to the aforesaid eleven's opinion, and perhaps his own opinion also? And has it not often happened that the one man's opinion was concurred in by a new jury? I would also ask Judge Hughes another question or two, and if I should happen to touch his tenderloin I pray him to excuse me, as I approach him only with the most profound respect. I would ask His Honor, what would he think of a British majority that would ignore the rights of his countrymen, the Welch? What would he

think if they were compelled to renounce their native language ; to forego their ancient customs and traditions—even to the wearing of the leek—because such things were disagreeable to the majority who ruled them ? What would he think if the weakest province in the Dominion was compelled by a majority of the other provinces to submit to restrictions and exactions that were inimical to its local interests, injurious to its local prosperity, and repugnant to the feelings and sentiment of its people ? What would he think if the priesthood of the Catholic majority of Quebec became so fanatical as to preach a crusade against the use of flesh meat on Friday, by either Catholic or Protestant, and that they got the people worked up to such a state of excitement that the Legislature had to pass a bill, similar in principle to the Scott Act, leaving the question in the hands of the majority ? Would he not think it was one of the most monstrous and tyrannical of Romish enactments ? Of course he would, and so would I, and so would every sensible man. But, then, are not the Methodist Preachers of Ontario doing precisely the same thing, only under a different guise ? Are they not, by pretending to crush intemperance, depriving moderate men of the privilege of using what in their judgment is fit and proper for them to use ? Are they not trying to take the bread and butter out of the mouths of thousands of children belonging to those engaged in the manufacture and sale of liquor, without giving them any compensation ? Are they not trying to make a hundred suffer for the sins of one ? I ask, if in a community of two thousand and ten the Scott Act were submitted and that one thousand and ten voted for it, and one thousand against it, and that among the latter thousand there were one hundred absolute drunkards, by what rule of justice, reason or right should nine hundred men, who are moderate, rational human beings, be prevented taking a drink if they want it ? Is it just that nine hundred men of common-sense should suffer for the folly of a hundred imbeciles ? If this is not downright tyranny then I do not know the meaning of the word. I will now make my obeisance to His Honor and proceed to the discussion of other questions. Before doing so, however, I would like to make one more remark (as I know that the judge is well up in Biblical lore) about the injustice of the Scott Act regarding minorities from a Biblical point of view. The citizens of Sodom and Gomorrah, we are told, were steeped to their necks in abomination, but the Almighty was willing to spare them if only ten good men could be found amongst them. Now the Scott Act reverses God's idea of justice by saying that nine hundred good men must suffer

because one hundred men are bad. It seems strange too that judges, like doctors, should differ so widely. At the same term in the city of London, the grand jury of Middlesex undertook the duty of lecturing, instead of being lectured, and embodied in their presentment a clause in favor of prohibition. But His Honor, Judge Elliott, politely rebuked them by declaring his entire disbelief in arbitrary or compulsory measures of any kind. Judge Elliott is a man who evidently understands what the rights and liberties of a British subject means, and is neither afraid nor ashamed to express his convictions when occasion requires it. A question for the serious consideration of every right-thinking man before voting on the Scott Act, is whether he will exercise his franchise on the side of liberty and justice or on that of tyranny and injustice. Those engaged in the manufacture and sale of liquor contribute more to the public treasury than any other class of people. In fact, they have to pay for the privilege of making a living, besides paying ordinary taxes, and notwithstanding this they don't ask the government to pass an act prohibiting teetotalism. The difference between the man who drinks and the prohibitionist is that the former merely asks the privilege of enjoying his own opinion without interfering with other people, or trying to coerce people to do as he does, whereas the latter is not content with being allowed the full and free enjoyment of his own opinions, but he asks the state to grant him power to compel others to do as he does, because he can not make them think as he thinks. The man who believes in prohibition believes in tyranny, and is by nature a tyrant. He may call himself a philanthropist at heart but he is a misanthropist in action. Men who vote for the Scott Act are unconsciously voting against their own interests by helping to bring about a state of things that will render taxation unbearable to the rising generation. Men are led away from a sensible consideration of the true nature of the question by the sophistry of the preachers and the pseudology of hired Yankee orators, who have no more interest in the material prosperity of this country than the Tycoon of Japan, and who regard temperance merely in the light of a good monetary speculation requiring only an investment of brazen rhetoric to secure a substantial remuneration. Murphy, the great Yankee temperance orator, wrote (in reply to a communication asking his assistance in the good cause) a long letter stating that his talents were always at the service of those engaged in the good cause, &c., but he added, by way of postscript, "my terms are fifty dollars per night, and expenses. Yours, in

Jesus, Francis Murphy." This is one of the class of humbugs that our patriotic prohibitionists are asking the Canadian people to be led by. The majorities given for the Scott Act have been obtained principally among the farming community. This class of people do not stop to consider the merits of prohibition any farther than it immediately affects themselves. They say: We don't care if all the hotels in the country were shut up, we make nothing out of them. And they vote accordingly. Now if the farmers would just consider for a moment the amount of revenue derived from the manufacture and sale of liquor, and then imagine this sum entirely cut off by prohibition and a deficit existing, which the government had to provide for from some source or other. Where do they think that deficit would come from? Would the preachers and the Yankee orators meet it? Oh, no. The farmers would have to foot the bill by paying the heaviest share of a direct taxation. Should such a calamity ever befall the country the proper course for the government to pursue would be to tax the Methodist Church direct for the full amount of the deficit. It is a sad state of affairs that a body of men who do not contribute a single cent to the government exchequer should have such a power as the Scott Act placed in their hands to be used to the disadvantage of our revenue system. When these men have tested their strength in various constituencies how do we know what they will be asking for next? Probably for an act empowering them to regulate religious worship in each constituency by a vote of the majority. There is no limit to the audacity of Methodism. A few days ago one of them said at a Scott Act meeting, that "the greatest legacy Canadians could leave to their children was prohibition." I answer, no, sir! Canadians were left a legacy by their forefathers which Methodism and fanaticism could never leave them; a legacy which every man should cherish as the greatest achievement that has ever been accomplished by human reason and self-sacrifice; a legacy which every man should guard as jealously as he would the most valued treasures; I mean the legacy of civil and religious liberty. This legacy has been secured to us in perpetuity, and if we lose it the fault is our own. If men who value civil rights allow those rights to be made subordinate to the caprice of a whimsical religious faction, they are unworthy to be entrusted with the exercise of the franchise. What is the true meaning of liberty, if it is not that every man should do unto his neighbor as he would wish should be done unto him. How then can a conscientious man look a neighbor in the face whom he has deprived, by his vote, of the means of making a

living for himself and family? How can he say that he loves his neighbor as himself? How can he say that he recognises and fully appreciates the blessings of civil liberty, when he tyrannically compels his neighbor, by law, to submit to his way of thinking? The fact of the matter is, the Methodist Church has taken up this prohibition question and made a dogma of it, and they are determined that even those who don't belong to them must subscribe to the dogma, because they have the law of the land to compel obedience to their dictation. Is it not time, therefore, for members of all denominations to rise in their intelligence and repel the aggressive pretensions of a sect so unscrupulously regardless of the rights and requirements of human nature; so utterly absorbed in selfishness that they do not understand the meaning of charity; so devoid of perception that they fail to recognise the claims of liberty and justice; and so overbearing that it is only a question of time when they will become absolutely intolerable. Ministers of every religious denomination should encourage and foster temperance amongst their flocks, not only temperance in eating and drinking; but, as St. Paul says, "temperance in all things." But, in the name of civil and religious liberty I will protest, to the hour of my death, against any religious body arming itself with an act of parliament and compelling men to subscribe to its peculiar notions of hygiene, political economy, or moral philosophy. If Canada had as many vineyards and factories for the production of pure native wine as it has Methodist Churches, it would be as wealthy and prosperous a country as there is in the world. Its people would be contented, happy, healthy and temperate, and ministers of religion could exercise their holy calling in a far more dignified and befitting manner than by stumping the country for election purposes. If the government would make the development of our vast resources in the culture of the grape a national question and grant an annual appropriation to the Minister of Agriculture for that object, they would do more for the cause of national temperance than all that has ever been done or can ever possibly be accomplished by such measures as the Scott Act. As I have already shown that in countries where wine is the national beverage, intemperance does not prevail, because it is not only the national beverage, but one of the most valuable components of the nation's food, it is unnecessary for me to point out what beneficial effects the cultivation of the vine would produce in Canada. I may state, however, that it is an established fact that the use of pure wine destroys all appetite for spirituous liquors, that it is the antidote of dyspepsia and delirium tremens, and, consequently, one of the

most wholesome diatetic ingredients required for physical sustenance. It is, therefore, the duty of every Canadian, especially every farmer (the young men in particular), to encourage the propagation of the vine. On every farm of 100 or 200 acres the cultivation of an acre or five acres of a vineyard would prove not only a pleasant pastime, but also a most lucrative engagement, not only for the young men on the farm, but also for the young women. And when they have attained the ages of their parents, and behold the fruits of their labor, they can refer with patriotic pride to the results of their efforts in developing one of the grandest and most inexhaustible of Canada's present undeveloped resources.

It seems strange that the clergymen who are advocating prohibition, do not reflect for a moment upon the effect which their action may produce upon Christianity. Can they not see that they are playing right into the hands of Free Thought and Infidelity by virtually admitting that Christianity is a failure, or at least so inherently weak that after a trial of 1884 years it is unable to propagate the simple moral principle of temperance without invoking the aid of the strong arm of the law? Can they not see that they are sowing dragons' teeth to spring up as swords for the army of Infidelity, the vanguard of which is already sapping and mining the ramparts of Christian faith? If they cannot, or will not see it, then upon their heads let the fatal consequences rest, of "the blind leading the blind."

To the independent and free men of Ontario; to every lover of civil and religious liberty; to every opponent of tyranny, in any shape, the above few expressions of conscientious conviction are respectfully dedicated by

VINO VERITAS.

sical
dian,
(r), to
f 100
of a
so a
n on
they
ruits
sults
most

ating
hich
not
ught
is a
1884
e of
f the
eeth
uard
s of
upon
blind
very
nny,
cious

S.